

REMARKS

Claims 1-25 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-8 and 11-23 have been amended.

The Examiner, the Examiner's supervisor, and the undersigned attorney held a telephone interview on June 15, 2005, during which they discussed claim 1. The substance of this interview is set forth herein.

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Coile.

Applicants respectfully traverse. As amended, claim 1 recites:

A method in a computer system for associating an identifier with a virtual process, the virtual process comprising a plurality of processes, the method comprising:
starting a first process;
associating the first process with a virtual process identifier;
creating, from the first process, a second process; and
associating the second process with the virtual process identifier.

The claimed invention associates identifiers with processes. In one embodiment, the first process is a system initialization process, and the second process is a descendant (child) process.

Coile does not disclose, suggest, or teach these claimed elements. Coile discusses handling, with a single physical machine, connection requests made for multiple virtual machines (abstract). Coile discusses a process for defining a virtual machine and binding it to a physical machine and port (FIG. 4A; 10:11-27). During the interview, the examiner stated that the steps 402, 404, 406, 408 in FIG. 4A can represent processes. Assuming, for the sake of argument, that one of these steps represents the first process and that another step represents the second process, Coile does not disclose associating either of these processes with an identifier. In fact, Coile does not disclose the processes represented by these steps at all, including 1) whether the second process was created from the first process and 2) whether either process was associated with anything. Thus, Coile does not disclose, suggest, or teach the claimed elements

"associating the first process with a virtual process identifier," "creating, from the first process, a second process," and "associating the second process with the virtual process identifier."

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Coile. Independent claims 11, 18, and 23-25¹ also recite similar features and are also patentable over Coile for at least the foregoing reasons.

The claims not specifically mentioned above incorporate the features of their respective base claims and are patentable for at least the same reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned in order to advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,
PAWAN GOYAL, ET AL.

Dated: 6-15-05

By: Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale
Sabra-Anne R. Truesdale
Reg. No. 55,687
Fenwick & West LLP
Silicon Valley Center
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (650) 335-7187
Fax.: (650) 938-5200

¹ Although paragraph 12 states that claim 25 is dependent, Applicants respectfully note that claim 25 is in fact independent. Also, two different rationales were given for the rejection of claim 25 (one in paragraph 4 and one in paragraph 12).